



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RACE SUICIDE IN THE UNITED STATES

By Dr. WARREN S. THOMPSON

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THREE are many people who think that race suicide means there is little or no natural increase (annual excess of births over deaths) in our population. Well-informed students of our population questions, however, have never used the term in this sense. They have never feared that our population was not growing rapidly enough by natural increase to hold its own with that of other countries. Professor Ross originally used the term—race suicide—to characterize what he believed to be a movement in the growth of our population leading to the extinction of the older native stock and its replacement with the newer immigrant stocks—the Slavic, the Latin and the Hebrew. According to this view our vital population questions are not questions of mere numbers but rather questions of quality.

Are the people of the older stock—those of Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic descent—gradually dying out and are they being replaced by the immigrants from southern and eastern Europe? If this is the case what are the effects upon our civilization going to be? These are the questions of vital concern to Americans. Those who believe that the older stock is dying out are quite likely to believe that with it are going the ideals and aspirations which have made America distinctive among the nations of the world. They feel that these new peoples with different racial traits, with different national histories and with different cultures are certain to make an America, not only different from but inferior to, what it would be if left in the possession of the older stock.

THE EVIDENCE OF RACE SUICIDE

Most of the evidence of race suicide comes from investigations made in New England. In Boston it was found that the old American stock has a natural increase of only about one per thousand per annum. As the report points out this is probably too low a rate of increase to represent the condition of the old native stock in other parts of the state but yet it shows that this stock is increasing very slowly. The rate of natural increase for the whole state is about ten per thousand per annum.

There is no room for doubt, therefore, that the newer stock is rapidly becoming a larger proportion of the entire population.

Another investigation giving much the same results was made by the Immigration Commission. It was found that in Rhode Island the native white women of native parentage who had been married from ten to twenty years had borne an average of 2.5 children, while the white women of foreign parentage had borne an average of 4.5 children. Thus the women of newer immigrant stock bore almost twice as many children as the women of native stock.

Experience and observation also confirm the more exact investigations. Those familiar with conditions in New England have borne almost universal testimony to the effect that the families of the older native people are smaller than those of the newer immigrant peoples.

There seems to be but one conclusion that has been drawn from such facts, viz., that the newer immigrants and their descendants are steadily becoming a larger proportion of the whole population. Without waiting to see whether other investigations in other parts of the nation would give similar results most people who have discussed this question have assumed that there is a general movement of this nature in our population. The result is that there has been a great hue and cry raised against race suicide. Before we join in this outcry, however, and indiscriminately urge people to raise larger families as some have already done, we should examine the facts more carefully.

There is very good reason to believe that the movement of population in New England is not typical of all parts of the United States. In the first place, New England has a larger urban and industrial population than any other section of the country. If, therefore, there is any difference in the rates of natural increase in the urban and rural populations they would not show in their true proportions in a study of the movement of population in New England. Besides most of the investigations and observations already referred to have been made in the cities. In the second place, the very fact that New England has a very large proportion of immigrants may have a direct effect upon the rate of natural increase of the native population. General Walker pointed out long ago that immigration was, in part, at least, a substitution of incoming peoples for those who would have been born to native parents had the immigrants not come. In the third place, the number of children born to native and foreign mothers is not a good measure of

THE PROPORTION OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN IN THE URBAN AND RURAL
 COMMUNITIES OF THE UNITED STATES, ALSO IN CERTAIN SELECTED
 CITIES AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Geographic Area	No. Children Under 5 Yrs. per 1,000 Women 15-44 Yrs.	No. Children 5-9 Yrs. per 1,000 Women 15-44 Yrs.	Per Cent. of Total Popula- tion Comprised by Women 15-44	Per Cent. of Total Popula- tion Native Born of Native Parents
United States:				
Urban, white	382	341	25.4	41.9
Rural, white.....	603	555	21.2	64.1
Urban, negro*.....	290	298	31.0	6.3
Rural, negro*.....	652	641	22.5	14.5
New England States:				
Urban, white	384	345	25.7	33.9
Rural, white.....	458	437	20.4	69.8
Middle Atlantic States:				
Urban, white	402	351	26.2	34.4
Rural, white.....	518	477	21.2	67.0
East North Central States:				
Urban, white	382	340	25.9	41.7
Rural, white.....	523	506	21.3	66.5
West North Central States:				
Urban, white	344	317	26.4	51.2
Rural, white.....	582	548	21.3	58.5
South Atlantic States:				
Urban, white	393	354	26.4	54.2
Rural, white.....	678	604	21.5	62.2
Urban, negro	296	298	31.1	29.4
Rural, negro.....	689	666	22.1	35.2
East South Central States:				
Urban, white	378	349	26.7	54.4
Rural, white.....	696	619	21.6	67.2
Urban, negro	272	281	31.1	32.3
Rural, negro.....	620	609	22.9	31.4
West South Central States:				
Urban, white	405	384	26.0	58.4
Rural, white.....	729	658	21.2	67.7
Urban, negro	298	317	30.6	22.3
Rural, negro.....	621	636	22.7	22.7
Mountain States:				
Urban, white	382	350	25.5	51.9
Rural, white.....	641	564	19.9	57.8
Pacific States:				
Urban, white	301	271	25.7	46.9
Rural, white.....	509	480	19.9	54.8
Boston, white.....	354	316	27.1	23.5
Fall River, white.....	445	397	26.4	13.3
New York City, white	394	341	27.2	19.3
Pittsburgh, white.....	420	354	26.0	33.0
Chicago, white.....	390	333	26.5	20.4
Cincinnati, white.....	294	266	27.7	42.6
Cleveland, white.....	433	349	25.9	23.6
Indianapolis, white.....	292	282	27.7	64.5
Milwaukee, white	388	345	26.1	21.1
Kansas City, Mo., white	270	248	28.6	61.9
Minneapolis, white.....	312	267	27.6	31.9
St. Louis, white	325	294	27.5	39.3
Baltimore, white.....	360	343	26.6	46.8

* This includes only the negro population of the South Atlantic, the East South Central and the West South Central States.

Geographic Area	No. Children Under 5 Yrs. per 1,000 Women 15-44 Yrs.	No. Children 5-9 Yrs. per 1,000 Women 15-44 Yrs.	Per Cent. of Total Population Comprised by Women 15-44	Per Cent. of Total Population Native Born of Native Parents
Birmingham, white.....	459	398	26.0	50.0
New Orleans, white.....	371	367	26.4	43.5
Salt Lake City, white.....	442	372	25.7	41.1
San Francisco, white.....	278	238	25.6	27.7
Seattle, white.....	286	256	25.6	44.6
United States, 1910 (white only) ..	484	440	23.3	
Australia, 1911.....	499	431	23.6	
German Empire, 1910	535	499	22.8	
France, 1901.....	409	367	22.8	
England and Wales, 1901	458	429	25.0	
1911	429	411	25.0	
Sweden, 1910	522	490	21.5	
Italy, 1911.....	566	492	22.0	
Russia (European), 1897.....	675	543	22.4	

the respective rates of natural increase. The death rate of the children of immigrants is much higher than that of children of natives. The presumption, then, is decidedly against accepting the view that the movement of population in New England is typical of all parts of the United States.

THE MOVEMENT OF THE POPULATION IN THE DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

In order to show the relative rates of increase of the urban and rural populations in different parts of the country I have prepared the table on p. 24. In this table the number of children 0-4 and 5-9 years of age (columns 1 and 2) per 1,000 women of child-bearing age—15-44 years of age—is given for a number of the different geographical and political units of the nation. The proportion of women 15-44 years of age and the proportion of native population to the whole population (columns 3 and 4) are also given for each of these units. At the end of the table will be found some of the same data for a few foreign countries.

Although this is not the most accurate way possible of measuring the rate of natural increase in different classes of the population and in different sections of the country, it is the best at present available and, on the whole, gives us a very good notion of the movements now taking place. The proportion of children to married, widowed and divorced women would not be as good an index of natural increase, because the presence of a large number of unmarried women or women who marry late in life, as in our city population at present, is in itself a proof of race suicide. To eliminate these women from the cal-

culations would, therefore, be to secure a measure of the relative size of the family in the country and the city rather than a measure of the natural increase.

The following data will show, however, that the conclusions to be drawn from the table referred to above would be corroborated by a more detailed study showing the proportion of children to married women.

NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS OF AGE PER 1,000 MARRIED, WIDOWED, OR DIVORCED WOMEN 15-44 YEARS OF AGE IN THE URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITIES OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS (WHITE POPULATION ONLY)

	Urban	Rural
United States	660	933
New England	714	718
Middle Atlantic	709	827
East North Central	645	828
West North Central	599	937
South Atlantic	672	1066
East South Central	632	1047
West South Central	633	1050
Mountain	601	907
Pacific	489	754

The fact standing out most clearly in the table given above is that in every state the proportion of children to women is greater in the country than in the cities. In the New England States as a whole the number of children under five years of age to 1,000 women is 19.3 per cent. greater in the rural districts than in the urban. In all the other geographical divisions of the nation the difference is even greater than in New England. In the Middle Atlantic States it is 28.8 per cent., in the East North Central States it is 36.9 per cent., while in the West South Central States it is 80.0 per cent. These facts show beyond question that the rural population has a greater rate of natural increase than the city population.

The full significance of this fact only becomes apparent, however, when we compare the proportion of native population in these two classes of communities. The proportion of native stock is invariably greater in the country than in the city. The greatest differences are to be found in New England and the Middle Atlantic States, but the difference is also considerable in the East North Central States. In the other parts of the nation the differences are not very large. It is also worth noting that in those sections where the differences are greatest the foreign stock in the cities is of the newer immigration,

while in those sections where the differences are comparatively small the foreigners in both country and city are of the older immigration.

THE INCREASE OF NATIVE AND FOREIGN STOCK IN THE CITIES.

The proportion of children to women in the urban population shows a remarkable uniformity throughout the United States. Only in the West North Central and Pacific States does the proportion fall below 375 per 1,000 and it exceeds 425 in only a few of the states—chiefly the southern states. But in spite of this great uniformity, it is apparent that those urban communities of the north and west of which the newer immigrants form a large proportion have a greater number of children per 1,000 women than those in which the proportion of native stock, or older immigrant stock, is large.

This appears more clearly if instead of confining our attention to the geographical divisions we pick out certain cities representative of different elements of the population. Practically any of the larger cities in the northeastern part of the country have a large proportion of the newer immigrants. Boston, New York, Chicago, Cleveland and Detroit, as well as many others, have a proportion of children much greater than Indianapolis, Kansas City, Denver and Los Angeles. In the former, people of the newer immigrant stocks predominate, while in the latter native stock predominates. In such cities as Cincinnati, St. Louis, Milwaukee and Minneapolis, where the older immigrant stocks (chiefly German and Scandinavian) predominate and there is also a good proportion of native stock the proportion of children is smaller than in the cities with the newer immigrant stocks, but larger than in the cities where native stock predominates. In the distinctly southern cities, however, where the white population is almost entirely native stock, the proportion of children is little, if any, smaller than in the northern cities with a large proportion of the newer immigrant stock. But only a small proportion of the city population of the United States is to be found in the southern states.

If, then, it were a question of the relative rates of natural increase of the native and immigrant stocks in our urban population only, there can be no doubt that the newer immigrants would become a steadily increasing proportion of the whole, with the older immigrants a poor second and the native stock an "also ran." But the urban population was only about 46 per cent. of our entire population at the last census. Therefore, before we become unduly excited about the extinction of the

Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic stock in our country, let us examine the data showing the proportion of children to women in the rural districts rather carefully.

THE INCREASE OF THE RURAL POPULATION COMPARED WITH THAT OF THE URBAN POPULATION

Although, as was pointed out above, the proportion of children in the rural districts is everywhere greater than in the cities, there is by no means as great a uniformity in this proportion in the country as in the city. There are three general divisions into which the states fall with respect to the proportion of children to women in the rural population:

1. *The New England and the Atlantic Coast States as Far South as Delaware.*—In these states the number of children varies from 412 in Massachusetts to 493 in Maine. This is the smallest proportion for any group of states. In all these states the rural population is a relatively small proportion of the whole and is largely composed of the old native stock. There has been a selective process going on for several generations in the rural population of these states. The more active, wide-awake, and ambitious men and women have either gone west to new lands or they have migrated to the cities to seek their fortunes. This has had a detrimental effect upon country life and is probably responsible in large measure both for the decadent population now to be found in the rural districts of these states and the unprogressive character of the farming carried on there.

2. *The States of the Northern, Central and Western Part of the Country.*—In these states there is a wide variation in the proportion of children to women. In general, however, they have more than 500 and less than 600. California and Nevada have less than 500, while the Dakotas and some of the other northwestern states have over 600. There does not seem to be any close relation between the foreign stock and a large proportion of children to women in these states. It is true that North Dakota with a very large foreign element in the rural population has over 700 children per 1,000 women, but there are several states with a preponderantly native element in the population which have a larger number of children per 1,000 women than Minnesota and Wisconsin, in which the population is largely composed of Germans and Scandinavians and their children. In those states where frontier conditions still exist, we almost invariably find a relatively large proportion of children. Thus the proportion of children in the rural population

seems to depend on the opportunities open to children in the country rather than on whether the people are old native stock or the older immigrant stock. The relatively small proportion of children in some of the far western states which still have frontier conditions is probably due largely to the greater independence and self-assertion of the western woman.

3. *The Southern and Southwestern States.*—In these states the number of children rarely falls below 650 per 1,000 women and in many exceeds 700 (we are discussing the white population only). In all these states the rural population is almost entirely composed of the old native stock. In the West South Central States about 10 per cent. of the population is of foreign stock. In the South Atlantic States only about 2.5 per cent. of it is of foreign stock, while in the East South Central States the proportion is even smaller. We are, therefore, justified in speaking of the rural population of this third great division as a native population, and it is in this part of our population that the greatest natural increase is taking place. As in the western states, where pioneer conditions still exist, the opportunities for children to do as well as their parents are relatively good here, and this is one of the important reasons for the high proportion of children.

Of our entire white population 51.3 per cent. lives in the rural districts, the remainder in the cities. In 36.6 per cent. of the rural population there are 650 or more children per 1,000 women; in 52.5 per cent. of it there are 500 to 650 children per 1,000 women, while in only 10.9 per cent. does the number of children fall below 500 per 1,000 women. In only 25.0 per cent. of the urban population, on the other hand, does the number of children rise above 400 per 1,000 women. Of this 25.0 per cent. over one fourth lives in the southern states, where the white population of the cities is almost entirely native stock. The other three fourths live in Connecticut, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, in none of which the number of children exceeds 433 per 1,000 women. Of our total white population in which the number of children exceeds 400 per 1,000 women, six sevenths live in the rural districts and one seventh in the urban.

The number of Italians, Slavs and Jews—the newer immigrants—to be found in the rural districts of the great agricultural states is negligible. On the other hand, the number of Germans, Scandinavians, English and Irish and their children is large, approximately one fourth of the entire rural white population being of these stocks.

In view of these facts, I can see no reason to be alarmed over

the rate of natural increase of the newer immigrants. They are not increasing as rapidly as the native and older immigrant peoples by excess of births over deaths. Although the relative rates of natural increase of the urban and rural population can not be calculated with exactness from the data given here, I have estimated them at 5 and 15, respectively. That is to say, in ten years the urban population would increase approximately 5 per cent., and the rural population 15 per cent. by natural increase. I believe that these estimates are conservative both with respect to the absolute rates in the two classes and with respect to the difference between these rates.

The reason for this difference between the rates of natural increase in the urban and rural population will be discussed in what follows.

REASONS FOR THE RATES OF NATURAL INCREASE OF THE DIFFERENT CLASSES IN OUR POPULATION

The reasons for the difference between the rates of natural increase in the urban and rural populations fall in two general classes: (1) Those which explain the difference in the death rates of these classes, and (2) those which explain the difference in the birth rates.

REASONS FOR THE DIFFERENCE IN DEATH RATES

The following table gives in very brief form the best data available regarding the difference between the death rates of our urban and rural populations:

NUMBER OF DEATHS PER ANNUM PER 1,000 PERSONS LIVING AT DIFFERENT AGES FOR MALES AND FEMALES IN THE ORIGINAL REGISTRATION
STATES: 1910 (WHITES ONLY)

	Males		Females	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Under 1 year of age.....	133.80	103.26	111.23	84.97
During tenth year of age.....	2.88	2.17	2.52	1.88
" twentieth year of age.....	4.49	4.31	3.82	3.97
" thirtieth year of age.....	6.83	5.33	6.08	5.44
" fortieth year of age.....	11.61	6.90	8.58	6.53
" fiftieth year of age.....	18.34	10.24	13.74	9.43
" sixtieth year of age.....	36.07	21.19	28.65	18.72
" seventieth year of age.....	69.42	48.79	59.16	45.12

This table shows that the death rates for both sexes are much lower in the country than in the city, with the exception that the death rate for women at about twenty years of age is

slightly higher in the country. It is worth noting too that the greatest excess of deaths in the cities occurs at the ages when the death rates are high. This would have the effect of raising the general death rate in the city much above that of the country. The general death rate in the country is probably about 13 per 1,000 per annum, while the general death rate in the cities is not less than 16 or 17 per 1,000. Thus if the country and city had the same birth rates, the country population would increase 3 or 4 per cent. more in ten years than the city population.

The outdoor life of country people is one of the important factors in keeping the rural death rate down. Country children spend most of their waking time, outside of school hours, out in the open. In going to and coming from school, at their chores and during their vacations country children get an abundance of good fresh air. They do not know what it is to breathe the dust- and germ-laden air which the city child must always breathe. The men spend even more of their time out in the open than the children. All their work takes them out into the sunshine and fresh air. They never feel the confinement of factories and stores, nor the blight of occupational diseases. They can not understand that work in reasonable quantity may be injurious to health, because they do not know the conditions under which many industrial workers ply their trades. The women, of course, do not live in the open as the children and men. But they get much out-of-door life during the warmer part of the year. They have their gardens to care for, the chickens to raise and many other light chores which take them out-of-doors. Besides if the country woman goes anywhere she does not go in a crowded street car. She is out in the open air in a buggy or automobile. There can be no doubt that the way of the country woman is more healthful.

There is room for much criticism of the country home because of its poor ventilation, lack of adequate heating and methods of sewage disposal. In spite of these deficiencies, however, there are very few country homes as unhealthful as the great number of tenement homes in the cities. The crowding of people together in small poorly ventilated and poorly lighted apartments, which is common among the lower classes of people in the larger cities, has no counterpart in the country. In hot weather when the city tenement dwellers suffer most from crowding and unsanitary living conditions, country people can get out-of-doors where there is always an abundance of fresh air and plenty of room for recreation. From whatever standpoint we contrast urban and rural conditions—from that of

conditions of work, from that of conditions of recreation and play, or from that of home conditions—we find that the out-of-doors, open-air life of country people gives them a decided advantage over city people in the matter of health.

Another reason for the lower death rate in the rural districts is that the country people are closer to the source of food and therefore have purer food than city people. In view of our present system of distribution it may seem to many that this is a relatively unimportant cause of better health in the country. It does not seem so to me, however. Country people have their own fresh vegetables in season and instead of buying canned vegetables for winter use put them up for themselves. They still raise much of their own meat—especially pork and poultry and veal. They also have eggs and milk and butter of the best and in abundance. Well-to-do people in the city can secure fresh and pure food, but the great majority of people have difficulty in doing so, as it is beyond their means. The very poor often use food which is entirely unfit for human consumption. The high death rate in this class is in part a result of this unhealthy diet.

In those classes in the city whose food is good there is a very large number of persons leading sedentary lives. These men are quite apt to overeat and underexercise, so that they do not use up their food and get rid of waste matter. The active life of the farmer, on the other hand, renders it unlikely that he will suffer from hearty eating. I have often been impressed by the fact that one sees many more soft flabby men among those pursuing sedentary occupations in the cities than among the farmers.

The relative security of the farmer's position is another reason for the low death rate in the country. He is not harassed by the uncertainty of his job and his income, as a great proportion of the salaried and wage-earning classes in the city. He does not need to fear that some machine will be invented to take his job, nor that he will be turned off in hard times because of lack of work. There is no danger that his industry will move away from him, forcing him to take up some new work or spend all of his savings to move his family to a new home. Nor do strikes and lock-outs affect the farmer in any appreciable degree. Besides, he does not have to compete with an ever renewed supply of immigrant laborers. The farmer has his "hard luck" as the city laborers, but it is not likely to force him into such dire straits as the former. If crops are a failure the whole neighborhood feels it, but no farmer is likely to lose

his position as a farmer because of that. He receives a temporary set-back and must curtail expenses, but he is in no danger of being in need of charity. This absence of worry on the part of the farmer no doubt helps to keep him healthy.

There is also very good reason to believe that the burden of accidents, industrial and other, falls more heavily on the city population than on the country population. Certain it is that a casual perusal of the daily papers leaves this impression. But more significant is the fact that it is the practise of insurance companies selling insurance to the lower classes in the cities, to charge them a much higher premium than they do farmers and those in other occupations. There seems to me to be no doubt that a part of the greater risk assumed in the case of hand laborers is due to the greater frequency of accident in this class.

Moreover, accidents in the city have more indirect effects contributing to a high death rate than they have in the country. Even with compensation from the employer, the city man's family is more likely to become destitute than the farmer's if he is injured. The farmer has more resources to fall back upon. For one thing the farmer's family is still an economic unit, in which each member, from a very early age, contributes something to the welfare of the whole, while in the city the workingman's family is very largely dependent upon him alone until the children are old enough to escape the provisions of the child labor laws. Besides even when the city boy can go to work, he can not at once take the place of his father, except in the unskilled occupations in which it is practically impossible for a man, single-handed, to make a living for himself and family. The farmer boy, on the other hand, can do his father's work in a pinch, and thus hold the fort until his father gets better. Even the wife and daughters can help in case of necessity and they often do. Then, too, neighborliness is more common in the country and can render greater assistance without savoring of charity than in the city. I would not imply that country people are naturally more kindly than city people, only that they live in such intimate daily relations that personal friendly aid of great value can be rendered in which there is no thought of condescension in the givers and no feeling of self-abasement in the recipients. Friendly aid of his neighbors has saved many a farmer from the worry of wondering how he was to care for his family during the coming winter. The city worker in the same situation would almost certainly have to look to charity to help him through. The different conditions of life make it

almost inevitable that accidents should entail more hardship and suffering on the workingman's family in the city than on the farmer's in the country.

Still another cause of the lower death rate in the country is what may be called the lower tension of competition in the rural districts. At whatever point one undertakes a comparison of urban and rural life with respect to the nature of their competitive processes, one finds a lower tension in the country.

For one thing, there is not the intense competition for place among men in the country that there is in the city. In the industrial and commercial world positions are graded so that there is always a more desirable one just ahead. This keeps the ambitious man continually striving for a better place and, since there are always more men who want the places just ahead than are needed to fill them, there is a constant struggle to secure them. There is no place one can stop to take a breath without fear that some one will step in ahead of him.

Among laboring men there is a somewhat similar process going on. Perhaps not quite so strenuous as among those in executive positions and the professions, but nevertheless quite strenuous enough to take a great deal of one's energies. There is the never-ending conflict of the skilled artisan with the machine designed to do his work; there is the constant change in methods and processes to which the man who has become settled in his habits finds it difficult to adjust himself; there is the competition between the immigrant and the unskilled worker, and to-day there is also the competition between men and women in numerous lines of work. All this striving for better places and to keep one's place is almost unknown in the country. The farmer may become old-fashioned and yet make a good living. He has very little need to fear that some one else can crowd him out if he does not want to go. And yet in many farming communities there is enough emulation to keep the farmer truly progressive.

Another way in which the difference between the country and the city in respect to competition manifests itself is in the attitude of the women toward dress. The continuous incitement to dress well and to vie with one's neighbors to which the city woman is subject is very largely lacking in the country. The city woman is forever seeing the new styles in the stores or on the streets, and she very soon comes to feel that she might just as well be out of the world as out-of-date. Besides in the city the success of the husband and the social position of the family are judged very largely by the outward show the family

makes. So "good-dressing" by the women is more than the satisfaction of personal vanity, it is the assertion of the right to a certain social position in the community. It is quite natural that this should be so in our modern cities, where people only know their neighbors by the clothes they wear and the automobiles they drive.

The country woman, on the other hand, does not need to assert her claims to a social position for the family by the way she and her daughters dress. Her neighbors know whether her husband owns his farm and whether he loans or borrows money. She can not impress her neighbors with outward show. In addition, the security of her position and in many cases the substantial prosperity of the family probably renders her more or less indifferent to the outward show of things. When people have back of them a secure and definite position in the community, they can afford to be less careful about the passing impressions they make. For this reason a majority of the farmers' wives care little about any luster they may add to the position of the family through the kind of competition for social position ordinarily practised by city people.

So it seems to me that from whatever angle we compare competition in the city and country, we find that the country requires less of its dwellers than the city and is therefore more favorable to good health.

(To be continued)